

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats, a regular meeting of the **Brown County Human Services Board** was held on Thursday, September 20, 2012 in Board Room A of the Sophie Beaumont Building – 111 North Jefferson Street, Green Bay, WI



Present: Chairman Tom Lund
Craig Huxford, Helen Smits, Carole Andrews, Paula Laundrie, JoAnn Grascberger

Excused: Bill Clancy, Susan Hyland

Also

Present: Jeremy Kral, Director of Community Programs
Mary Johnson, Hospital & Nursing Home Administrator
Tim Schmitt, Finance Manager
Jim Hermans, Child Protection/Juvenile Justice Manager
Scott Shackelford, Juvenile Justice Supervisor

-
1. **Call Meeting to Order:**
The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Lund at 5:20 pm.
 2. **Approve/Modify Agenda:**
ANDREWS/LAUNDRIE moved to approve the agenda.
The motion was passed unanimously.
 3. **Approve Minutes of August 16, 2012 Human Services Board Meeting:**
SMITS/ANDREWS moved to approve the minutes dated August 16, 2012.
The motion was passed unanimously.
 4. **Executive Director's Report**

Jeremy Kral, Director of Community Programs, prepared a report for the board as Executive Director Shoup was not able to attend the meeting due to another meeting with ranking Department of Health Services officials in Madison.

Lean Activities

- The Department has been a vital participant in two LEAN events since the last Board meeting. These two events were particularly exciting to those involved because both the Emergency Detention LEAN event on August 29-30 and the Bay Lake Economic Assistance Consortium event on September 19 involved our BCDHS personnel in conjunction with community partners including: Brown County Sheriff's Office, City of Green Bay Police Dept., local health care system administration, the counties of Shawano, Door, Oconto, and Marinette and many others. The emergency detention event was also observed by officials from Racine County. Many recommendations were generated and while

implementation will take time, efforts are already underway to implement efficiencies discovered through these LEAN processes.

Family Care Update

- The State of Wisconsin Department of Health Services' initial budget submission did not include expansion of Family Care to Brown County and the surrounding region. This occurrence was not unanticipated and does not necessarily indicate the intentions of that Department. It is common for program initiatives to be introduced later in the state budget process and the department remains engaged in preparation for Family Care as of now. We are still looking at the target date of early 2014 to roll into Family Care.

5. Financial Report

- Schmitt reported financials through July. For Community Programs we are ahead of budget with a \$500,000 surplus due to lower contracted services costs. For the Community Treatment Center, we are showing an unfavorable budget of \$100,000 as a result of lower revenues due to a lower number of hospital inpatient stays.

HUXFORD/GRASCHBERGER moved to receive items 4 & 5 and place on file.
Motion was carried unanimously

6. Policy Development Issue: Local Alternatives to State Correctional Placements

- Jim Hermans, Child Protection/Juvenile Justice Manager, and Scott Shackelford, Juvenile Justice Supervisor, presented about local alternatives to state correctional placements.
- Hermans summarized what brought them to this initiative. There are three main priorities that the unit is responsible for as it relates to juvenile justice and all are equally important.
 1. Need to protect the community/public safety
 2. Need to hold youth accountable for actions and behaviors
 3. We have a responsibility to rehabilitate youth so they can become a successful member of society as an adult
- Through discussions about the current system, the possibility of an alternative that would allow us to serve youth that have committed serious unlawful acts. Always sending them to the state correctional facility has not consistency produced the outcomes we want to see. Reintegrating them back into the community can be difficult.
- Hermans stated that not all kids or situations are the same and when we are limited to only one response, it does not always produce the right outcome. Providing this alternative will not mean that all youth will be eligible as some may still need to go to the state facility. We would just look at how to match the youth up in the facility that would be most successful for their rehabilitation.
- Shackelford stated that since 2007, their unit has been moving toward developing more resources for youth in that continuum of placements. When they cannot be in their home the options include a relative, foster home, group home, residential home and above that, state corrections.
- Shackelford added that there is a niche of needing a resource/placement to hold kids locally where they wouldn't be able to leave but they can receive services. Currently at the state facility, it is difficult to get families and social workers there for

frequent contact. There has been communication with the judges and we have received support/endorsement and their assurance that they would use the resource if we developed in locally. There is capacity for secure detention at the Brown County Jail where the same services Lincoln Hills (state facility) provides, we can have done locally.

- Hermans stated that the primary reason for this initiative is not to save money although there is a byproduct for saving taxpayer money. The primary reason is that it would be better for the youth and their families. With using a shorter period of incarceration we could gain control over after care recommendations and be more successful with reintegration back into a community setting. A new law has allowed for 180 days at a local facility.
- Shackelford stated this would be another option for the judges to order when appropriate. We have met with public defenders and the district attorney's office who are also in support of having this as an option. Programming-wise, we already have some group programming in place. At Lincoln Hills, you get the standard package but locally, we could have more dual programming and cater for specific cases.

Q: Citizen Board Member Huxford asked if we are going to be limited with treatment now with the law as 180 days locally would be less than the year allowed at Lincoln Hills.

A: Shackelford stated that previously, we have only had the ability to place youth at a local facility for 30 days and now we can elongate it for a maximum time of 180 days in secure detention. We want to think more in terms of a maximum of a 90 day program.

Q: Citizen Board Member Laundrie asked at what point we would be bringing in families as part of this program.

A: Shackelford stated that we may be doing some family counseling right away if needed and visitation will happen daily. Hermans added that we have a very strong family focus. Working with the family and community are the parts that are not occurring as readily with the long-term placements and state corrections. That is why some of those cases were not successful coming back. Shackelford stated there is a TV upstairs in their conference room and although they are able to communicate with Lincoln Hills staff and see the youth, it is not effective as in-person. Hermans stated each of the brown county board oversight committees for Human Services and Sheriff would have to approve a resolution enabling the judges to use this secure detention facility for these placements.

Q: Citizen Board Member Huxford asked if there is enough capacity in the secure detention center.

A: Shackelford stated there is room and has tracked the numbers to show about 12 placements there in a calendar year. Although the placements will not be a large increase, there will be a longer term placement. The facility was built with larger capacity than their current daily census. Hermans added that there is some interest in opening this up to a regional use where other counties would buy this type of service/opportunity from us.

Q: Citizen Board Member Laundrie asked if outside county workers would be then traveling here to meet with their clients.

A: Hermans answered yes and that it would be important for them to work directly with clients and would be beneficial since they wouldn't need to travel as far as Lincoln Hills.

Q: Citizen Board Member Laundrie asked how we are going to staff this and if there will be case managers for these kids.

A: Shackelford stated there will not be any additional staff needed. We are going to try to purchase as little outside vendor services as needed.

Citizen Board Member Huxford stated that from his past experience he believes Lincoln Hills is designed for the most severe cases and the lesser cases would benefit from this initiative.

LAUNDRIE/SMITS moved to receive and place on file.
Motion was carried unanimously

7. Statistical Reports:

Please refer to the packet which includes this information.

8. Approval for New Non-Continuous Vendor:

Please refer to the packet which includes this information.

9. Request for New Vendor Contract:

Please refer to the packet which includes this information.

10. Other Matters:

Next Meeting: Thursday, October 11, 2012
5:15 p.m. – Sophie Beaumont Building, Board Room A

11. Adjourn Business Meeting:

ANDREWS/LAUNDRIE moved to adjourn; motion passed unanimously. Chairman Lund adjourned the meeting at 5:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kara Navin
Recording Secretary